

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-104 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-92 have been amended. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by way of this amendment.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner notes that various trademarks should be replaced throughout the application with generic terminology. Applicants submit that the use of the terms fairly describe illustrative examples of aspects of the invention described in the specification. However, if the Examiner would like Applicants to supplement the trademarks with generic terms, Applicants submit that the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned or otherwise suggest changes to these terms to alleviate the Examiner's concerns in this regard.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-68 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) in view of USP 6,535,883 to Lee. Claims 69-104 were also rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) in view of USP 6,167,523 to Strong. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that the amended claims are patentably distinct from the cited references.

With regard to claims 1-92, the Examiner states, "that the features upon which applicants relies (i.e., subclassed or take on different characteristics from its parent...." (See, Office

Action, page 14, ¶ 3). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 51, 57, 62, 68, 75, 81 and 87 to further clarify these claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amended claims are patentably distinct from the cited reference. More specifically, these claims recite "customizable validation rules." The cited references fail to teach or suggest such customizable rules and a rules library of any sort. Although the Examiner previously noted the use of a "template", a template is simply not a library, nor a library of customizable rules. A template allows for the making clones of itself. In contrast, the claimed customizable rules and rules library, described throughout the disclosure, is significantly different and not so limited. For example, Applicants submit that a template may not be subclassed or take on different characteristics from its parent as may be achieved with the claimed customizable rules.

With regard to claims 93-104, the Examiner indicates, "The applicant states that the cited reference does not disclose regular expression." (See, Office Action, page 14, ¶4). However, Applicants submit that the Examiner has over-generalized the claim language. The Applicants submit that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest the "determination if a browser supports regular expressions", as recited in the claims. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the references' silence regarding regular expressions simply evidences that the references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the determination of whether or not regular expressions are supported by a browser, as claimed. If the Examiner maintains the rejection of these claims based on the Strong reference, Applicants request clarification of the Examiner's position regarding Strong's alleged disclosure of such a determination.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the cited references fails to disclose or teach: customizable rules; a rules library; and the ability to determine the presence or absence of regular

expression capabilities in a browser and provide alternative validation rules. Based on the deficiencies of the cited references discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to anticipate any of claims 1-104. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of these grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

As such, Applicants submit the claimed invention recited in independent claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 51, 57, 62, 68, 75, 81, 87, 93, 96, 99 and 102 are clearly patentably distinct from the cited references for at least these reasons, among others. Furthermore, in view of the fact that each of the independent claims of the instant application are distinguishable from the cited references for the aforementioned reason, Applicants submit that the dependent claims of the instant application are also distinguishable for at least similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of rejections.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17200-602. In the event that an additional extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17200-602.

Respectfully Submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE, L.L.P.

BY:



Daniel C. Sheridan
Registration No. 53,585

Date: December 6, 2005

Address:

Chadbourne & Parke, L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-5100 Telephone
212-541-5369 Facsimile